

met with the Sandy Hook people on several occasions. They are not asking for anything that is outrageous. Their first step is to say that someone who is crazy—I am sorry, that is not a good term of art—someone who has extreme mental problems should not be able to buy a gun. Someone who is a criminal should not be able to buy a gun. That is all we want. We will settle for that. The people of Sandy Hook will settle for that.

I admire what the Presiding Officer has done and what Senator BLUMENTHAL has done. We cannot let these terrible things that happened in Aurora, CO—someone walks in with a weapon that has a magazine of 100 bullets. He would have killed a lot more, but the gun jammed.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. REID. I ask the Chair to announce the business of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5 o'clock p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, tomorrow we will continue the markup on the Gang of 8 immigration bill. They have been meeting with businesspeople and special interest groups trying to craft a piece of legislation they can agree to, that they think is good. They didn't have anybody representing mainstream America. They didn't have anyone representing the law enforcement community who would explain how this system ought to work. As a result, their bill doesn't have any kind of improvements in our law enforcement that would be effective.

I wanted to talk today, because we will be going into it tomorrow, about the fundamental question on the nature of our immigration; how much this country would be able to sustain

in a healthy way for immigrants, as well as American workers.

I have been concerned for some time that the numbers are just too large. We are not able to effectively assimilate people in these large numbers. Significantly, we don't have sufficient jobs to allow us to employ them. As the bill stands now, it would have only a negative impact on American workers.

People say: You need to be positive, Sessions. We are growth oriented. We are just going to grow this economy, and there will be plenty of jobs out there. Be like Ronald Reagan, would you? Be sunny all the time. Don't talk negatively. Don't worry about this.

I am looking at some numbers, and I think it is wise for America to be prudent, smart, and careful, before we establish policies we can't sustain, before we establish policies that create more unemployment in America and damage our economy. That could happen.

I asked one of the sponsors of the bill, Senator SCHUMER, how many people would be admitted under the bill. Well, he wouldn't say.

I said: It looks like it might be 30 million; is that correct?

He said: No.

I said: Well, how many is it, Senator SCHUMER?

He didn't say. They have yet to say how many people would be admitted under the biggest change in immigration we have had since at least 1986, and really it is larger in its impact than 1986.

This is an odd thing. Frankly, we ought not to proceed another day in the Judiciary Committee until the sponsors of the bill—and their great advisers who have been meeting for months, aided by the administration and all the staffs they have in Homeland Security and the Department of Justice—can tell us how many people would be admitted. They don't do that, I think, fundamentally because they don't want us to know. They really don't want to acknowledge what a huge alteration in our policies this will have in terms of economics and so forth.

Let's think about it. Here are some of the things we know: We know 11 million people are here illegally—some say 12 million—and they would all be given a legal status. Virtually all would be given a legal status immediately.

They would then immediately be allowed to pursue any job they would like to take. They could go down and apply for the county government, the city government, trucking firms, coal mining companies, oil companies, any good job out there they would like to apply for. That is not happening now because many of them have no identification and aren't able to take anything other than jobs off the books. Some have estimated—supporters of the bill—that at least half of the people here illegally are working off the books in some form or fashion. These numbers are big. We have those numbers.

In addition, there is a plan over the next years to legalize 4.5 million addi-

tional individuals in the so-called backlog. They are really not backlogged in the sense the immigration service isn't processing their papers fast enough, they are backlogged because we had caps on how many in these categories could come in and people apply until they reach the number. Well, they would remove the caps on those. That would be another 4.5 million that would come in.

Then they have a future flow that we are working hard on to analyze with my staff. I don't have the entire immigration service. I don't have the immigration lawyers association. I don't have the chamber of commerce or Richard Trumka to come in and do all the work for me, but we think there will be quite a number of immigrants coming in the future.

The Los Angeles Times—and I will use their number; it seems to be the number others have come up with and may be in the ballpark—they have increased the annual flow by 50 percent. That would be a 50-percent increase. We are supposed to be at about 1 million a year now, and this would increase the legal flow by 50 percent. It could be considerably more. So we estimate that something like 30 million people will be given legal status in the next 10 years, when, if the law were faithfully applied, there would be about 10 or 11 million over the next 10 years given legal status. Yes, of that 30 million, about 10 or so—10-plus—will be those who are already here, but many of those are really not effectively competing for jobs with the American worker, who by a large degree is out of work and needing a job.

First and foremost we are a nation of immigrants. We have always had a generous immigration policy. A million immigrants a year exceeds that of any other country in the world ever, and we are about to absorb a huge number of new people—15 million—and then we are going to increase the flow by 50 percent. So I am asking, can we handle this? That is all I am asking at this point on this subject, and we really should think about that. Don't we owe it to our workers to ask those questions?

Professor Borjas, at Harvard—himself an immigrant and the most serious student of immigration and wages and jobs in America, and he wrote a book on it a number of years ago and still writes papers in contributing to the debate—has demonstrated absolutely, through intense, high-level economic studies, that increases in workers produces reduced wages. Surprise—more workers reduces wages. It allows a business to find a worker without having to pay more money. They would be able to get more people to work for less, and they like that. That is great—for them.

My Democratic colleagues have been pointing out for a long time—and, sadly, there is too much truth in their complaints—that the average wage of the American worker since at least